



## California Climate Investments Implemented Projects by Region, Metropolitan Planning Organization, County, Rural/Urban County Designation, and Legislative District

Projects Implemented Through November 30, 2018

### Introduction

This document supplements the information provided in the *2019 Annual Report to the Legislature on California Climate Investments Using Cap-and-Trade Auction Proceeds* (Annual Report) and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF or Fund) Project List<sup>1</sup> by summarizing California Climate Investments by region, Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), county, rural/urban county designation, and legislative district.

The data provided here is derived from the data in the Project List and represents \$3.36 billion in cumulative funding for “Implemented Projects” as of November 30, 2018.

Most projects can be tied to one project address, although a number of GGRF projects span multiple geographic boundaries (e.g., a transit bus line or large forestry project). Where it is not feasible to associate a project with a single region, district, or county, the same project data is included in each area that benefits from the investment. This method of attribution tends to increase the implemented project totals reported here. Implemented High-Speed Rail Project funds (\$626M) have been omitted, which decreases implemented project totals in this document.

As a result, the “Total Funding Implemented” summations in this document differ from the individual project funding summation values in the Annual Report. See the GGRF Project List for a more detailed explanation of the methodology CARB used to evaluate projects that cross geographic boundaries.

Summary of GGRF Funding Status as of November 30, 2018

	2018	Cumulative
Appropriated	\$3.2B	\$9.3B
Allocated	\$2.9B	\$8.9B
Selected & Awarded	\$4.4B	\$7.4B
Implemented	\$1.4B	\$3.4B

<sup>1</sup> See [caclimateinvestments.ca.gov](http://caclimateinvestments.ca.gov).



## California Climate Investments Implemented Projects by Region

Projects Implemented Through November 30, 2018

Note: Projects that cross regional boundaries are counted for each region that the project is located in (e.g., once for each region a new 10-mile transit bus route has a stop in), or once for a single region if the specific location of the GGRF funded improvements could be identified (e.g., for affordable housing at a particular address). Due to accounting for projects that cross regional boundaries, and because funds for the High-Speed Rail Project have been omitted, the summation of funds by region (\$3.30B) is less than the total implemented funds, as reported in the 2019 Annual Report (\$3.36B). Likewise, the summation of funds benefiting priority populations by region (\$2.46B) is higher than the priority population total implemented funds as reported in the 2019 Annual Report (\$1.92B).

Region	Total Implemented Funds by Region	% of Implemented Funds (\$3.36B)	Regional Funds Benefiting Priority Populations	% of Regional Funds Benefiting Priority Populations
Bay Area	\$726,031,973	22%	\$483,282,388	67%
Los Angeles / Inland Empire	\$1,210,693,995	36%	\$1,008,566,545	83%
San Diego / Imperial	\$250,860,713	7%	\$202,005,243	81%
San Joaquin Valley	\$571,051,171 <sup>2</sup>	17%	\$460,879,237	81%
Other Regions	\$541,324,965	16%	\$302,578,184	56%

### **Region Definitions (Counties):**

<i>Bay Area:</i>	Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma counties.
<i>San Joaquin Valley:</i>	Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tulare counties.
<i>Los Angeles / Inland Empire:</i>	Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura counties.
<i>San Diego / Imperial:</i>	Imperial and San Diego counties.

<sup>2</sup> This value does not include \$626M in funding for the High-Speed Rail Project.



## California Climate Investments Implemented Projects by Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

Projects Implemented Through November 30, 2018

Note: Projects that cross Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) boundaries are counted for each MPO that the project is located in, (e.g., once for each MPO a new 10-mile transit bus route has a stop in), or once for a single MPO if the specific location of the GGRF funded improvements could be identified (e.g., for affordable housing at a particular address). Due to accounting for projects that span MPO boundaries, and because High-speed Rail funds have been omitted, the summation of funds by MPO (\$3.30B) is less than the total implemented funds as reported in the Annual Report (\$3.36B).

MPO	Counties	Total Implemented Funds by MPO	% of Implemented Funds (\$3.36B)
AMBAG	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz	\$66,739,905	2%
BCAG	Butte	\$38,085,294	1%
FresnoCOG	Fresno	\$137,484,115 <sup>3</sup>	4%
KCAG	Kings	\$38,051,256	1%
KCOG	Kern	\$62,677,218	2%
MCAG	Merced	\$47,361,508	1%
MCTC	Madera	\$19,048,718 <sup>3</sup>	1%
MTC	Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, Sonoma	\$726,031,973	22%
SACOG	Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, Yuba	\$174,976,057	5%
SANDAG	San Diego	\$242,318,829	7%
SBCAG	Santa Barbara	\$17,533,785	1%
SCAG	Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura	\$1,219,235,879	36%
SJCOG	San Joaquin	\$66,267,093	2%
SLOCOG	San Luis Obispo	\$19,141,161	1%
SRTA	Shasta	\$31,845,285	1%

<sup>3</sup> This value does not include \$626M in funding for the High-Speed Rail Project.

MPO	Counties	Total Implemented Funds by MPO	% of Implemented Funds (\$3.36B)
StanCOG	Stanislaus	\$60,326,677	2%
TCAG	Tulare	\$139,834,586	4%
TMPO	El Dorado, Placer	\$66,497,083	2%
Non-MPO	Amador, Alpine, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Siskiyou, Plumas, Sierra, Trinity, Tehama, Tuolumne	\$126,506,395	4%



## California Climate Investments Implemented Projects by County

Projects Implemented Through November 30, 2018

Note: Projects that cross county boundaries are counted for each county that the project is located in (e.g., once for each county a new 10-mile transit bus route has a stop in), or once for a single county if the specific location of the GGRF funded improvements could be identified (e.g., for affordable housing at a particular address). Due to accounting for projects that cross county boundaries, and because funding for the High-Speed Rail Project have been omitted, the summation of funds by county (\$3.30B) is less than the total implemented funds as reported in the Annual Report (\$3.36B).

County	Total Implemented Funds by County through 2018	% of Implemented Funds (\$3.36B)
Alameda	\$205,748,734	7.5%
Alpine	\$84,998	<0.1%
Amador	\$1,157,297	<0.1%
Butte	\$38,085,294	1.4%
Calaveras	\$5,424,767	0.2%
Colusa	\$6,943,772	0.3%
Contra Costa	\$55,016,762	2.0%
Del Norte	\$1,147,913	<0.1%
El Dorado	\$29,632,134	1.1%
Fresno	\$137,484,115 <sup>4</sup>	5.0%
Glenn	\$6,684,390	0.2%
Humboldt	\$9,609,001	0.4%
Imperial	\$8,541,884	0.3%
Inyo	\$1,370,787	0.1%
Kern	\$62,677,218	2.3%
Kings	\$38,051,256	1.4%
Lake	\$2,821,453	0.1%
Lassen	\$7,469,571	0.3%
Los Angeles	\$678,243,416	24.8%
Madera	\$19,048,718 <sup>4</sup>	0.7%
Marin	\$33,362,923	1.2%
Mariposa	\$2,726,734	0.1%

<sup>4</sup> This value does not include \$626M in funding for the High-Speed Rail Project.

County	Total Implemented Funds by County through 2018	% of Implemented Funds (\$3.36B)
Mendocino	\$7,356,060	0.3%
Merced	\$47,361,508	1.7%
Modoc	\$1,931,736	0.1%
Mono	\$1,362,662	<0.1%
Monterey	\$35,485,696	1.3%
Napa	\$12,222,094	0.4%
Nevada	\$16,506,331	0.6%
Orange	\$182,684,080	6.7%
Placer	\$36,864,949	1.4%
Plumas	\$20,670,612	0.8%
Riverside	\$155,187,053	5.7%
Sacramento	\$113,550,580	4.2%
San Benito	\$661,155	<0.1%
San Bernardino	\$129,437,113	4.7%
San Diego	\$242,318,829	8.9%
San Francisco	\$196,048,322	7.2%
San Joaquin	\$66,267,093	2.4%
San Luis Obispo	\$19,141,161	0.7%
San Mateo	\$39,251,464	1.4%
Santa Barbara	\$17,533,785	0.6%
Santa Clara	\$141,062,237	5.2%
Santa Cruz	\$30,593,054	1.1%
Shasta	\$31,845,285	1.2%
Sierra	\$734,639	<0.1%
Siskiyou	\$17,764,294	0.7%
Solano	\$5,560,378	0.2%
Sonoma	\$37,759,059	1.4%
Stanislaus	\$60,326,677	2.2%
Sutter	\$3,157,269	0.1%
Tehama	\$6,630,411	0.2%
Trinity	\$1,215,097	<0.1%
Tulare	\$139,834,586	5.1%
Tuolumne	\$6,893,870	0.3%
Ventura	\$65,142,333	2.4%
Yolo	\$52,722,275	1.9%
Yuba	\$5,545,933	0.2%



## California Climate Investments Implemented Projects by Rural/Urban County Designation

Projects Implemented Through November 30, 2018

Note: Projects that cross county boundaries are counted for each county that the project is located in (e.g., once for each county a new 10-mile transit bus route has a stop in), or once for a single county if the specific location of the GGRF funded improvements could be identified (e.g., for affordable housing at a particular address). Due to accounting for projects that cross county boundaries, and because funding for the High-Speed Rail Project has been omitted, the summation of funds by rural/urban designation (\$3.30B) is less than the total implemented funds as reported in the Annual Report (\$3.36B).

Rural/Urban	Total Implemented Funds <sup>5</sup>	% of Implemented Funds (\$3.36B)	Funds Benefiting Priority Populations	% of Funds Benefiting Priority Populations
Rural	\$608,929,699	18.1%	\$342,378,559	56.2%
Urban	\$2,691,033,118	80.2%	\$2,114,933,038	78.6%

### ***Rural/Urban Designation<sup>6</sup> (Counties):***

***Rural:*** Alpine, Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, El Dorado, Glenn, Humboldt, Imperial, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Madera, Mariposa, Mendocino, Merced, Modoc, Mono, Napa, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Sonoma, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Tulare, Tuolumne, Yolo, and Yuba counties.

***Urban:*** Alameda, Contra Costa, Fresno, Kern, Kings, Los Angeles, Marin, Monterey, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Stanislaus, and Ventura counties.

<sup>5</sup> These values do not include \$626M in funding for the High-Speed Rail Project.

<sup>6</sup> Urban/Rural designation based off of Rural County Representatives of California rural counties list.



## California Climate Investments Implemented Projects by State Senate District

Projects Implemented Through November 30, 2018

Note: Projects that cross State Senate district boundaries are counted for each district that the project is located in (e.g., once for each district a new 10-mile transit bus route has a stop in), or once for a single district if the specific location of the GGRF funded improvements could be identified (e.g., for affordable housing at a particular address). Due to accounting for projects that cross districts, the summation of funds by Senate district (\$4.45B) is greater than the total implemented funds as reported in the Annual Report (\$3.36B).

Senate	Total Implemented Funds by District through 2018	% of Implemented Funds (\$3.36B)
01	\$157,093,764	5.8%
02	\$71,977,299	2.6%
03	\$88,888,774	3.3%
04	\$69,421,120	2.5%
05	\$74,666,752	2.7%
06	\$122,234,791	4.5%
07	\$54,936,317	2.0%
08	\$118,175,929 <sup>7</sup>	4.3%
09	\$172,650,663	6.3%
10	\$70,889,447	2.6%
11	\$197,280,295	7.2%
12	\$139,337,624 <sup>7</sup>	5.1%
13	\$56,882,217	2.1%
14	\$255,231,206 <sup>7</sup>	9.3%
15	\$89,234,224	3.3%
16	\$74,531,241	2.7%
17	\$74,140,823	2.7%
18	\$127,749,912	4.7%
19	\$74,258,825	2.7%
20	\$111,455,905	4.1%
21	\$123,850,300	4.5%
22	\$108,463,297	4.0%

<sup>7</sup> This value does not include \$626M in funding for the High-Speed Rail Project.



Senate	Total Implemented Funds by District through 2018	% of Implemented Funds (\$3.36B)
23	\$74,745,404	2.7%
24	\$161,271,041	5.9%
25	\$132,915,988	4.9%
26	\$105,766,880	3.9%
27	\$118,915,562	4.4%
28	\$58,925,435	2.2%
29	\$81,596,793	3.0%
30	\$125,256,661	4.6%
31	\$110,234,167	4.0%
32	\$115,737,185	4.2%
33	\$168,043,435	6.2%
34	\$116,251,167	4.3%
35	\$133,993,204	4.9%
36	\$77,200,893	2.8%
37	\$97,072,947	3.6%
38	\$99,882,812	3.7%
39	\$110,253,898	4.0%
40	\$128,327,021	4.7%



## California Climate Investments Implemented Projects by State Assembly District

Projects Implemented Through November 30, 2018

Note: Projects that cross State Assembly district boundaries are counted for each district that the project is located in (e.g., once for each district a new 10-mile transit bus route has a stop in), or once for a single district if the specific location of the GGRF funded improvements could be identified (e.g., for affordable housing at a particular address). Due to accounting for projects that cross district boundaries, the summation of funds by Assembly district (\$5.48B) is greater than the total implemented funds as reported in the Annual Report (\$3.36B).

Assembly	Total Implemented Funds by District through 2018	% of Implemented Funds (\$3.36B)
01	\$123,392,370	4.5%
02	\$49,653,427	1.8%
03	\$51,625,938	1.9%
04	\$68,197,382	2.5%
05	\$64,525,215 <sup>8</sup>	2.4%
06	\$17,501,949	0.6%
07	\$102,836,041	3.8%
08	\$27,878,535	1.0%
09	\$24,478,898	0.9%
10	\$46,487,866	1.7%
11	\$34,224,777	1.3%
12	\$19,749,274	0.7%
13	\$58,104,414	2.1%
14	\$25,238,869	0.9%
15	\$57,080,636	2.1%
16	\$30,623,930	1.1%
17	\$191,587,478	7.0%
18	\$125,460,344	4.6%
19	\$78,553,673	2.9%
20	\$30,222,774	1.1%


<sup>8</sup> This value does not include \$626M in funding for the High-Speed Rail Project.

Assembly	Total Implemented Funds by District through 2018	% of Implemented Funds (\$3.36B)
21	\$101,819,908	3.7%
22	\$25,582,264	0.9%
23	\$47,368,921 <sup>8</sup>	1.7%
24	\$35,456,962	1.3%
25	\$52,522,657	1.9%
26	\$142,135,773	5.2%
27	\$63,044,856	2.3%
28	\$53,792,880	2.0%
29	\$28,239,537	1.0%
30	\$56,607,181	2.1%
31	\$113,229,490 <sup>8</sup>	4.1%
32	\$87,212,116	3.2%
33	\$17,125,016	0.6%
34	\$14,621,580	0.5%
35	\$22,251,232	0.8%
36	\$110,401,626	4.0%
37	\$63,132,047	2.3%
38	\$98,305,286	3.6%
39	\$116,160,980	4.3%
40	\$63,911,126	2.3%
41	\$76,275,504	2.8%
42	\$12,460,264	0.5%
43	\$102,088,391	3.7%
44	\$59,458,206	2.2%
45	\$91,557,667	3.4%
46	\$83,252,376	3.0%
47	\$81,139,560	3.0%
48	\$76,552,715	2.8%
49	\$73,677,038	2.7%
50	\$81,462,082	3.0%
51	\$108,245,690	4.0%
52	\$79,118,943	2.9%
53	\$206,909,973	7.6%
54	\$82,637,992	3.0%
55	\$66,850,754	2.4%
56	\$49,389,176	1.8%
57	\$102,581,152	3.8%
58	\$88,606,340	3.2%
59	\$88,653,586	3.2%
60	\$64,442,593	2.4%
61	\$91,826,192	3.4%

Assembly	Total Implemented Funds by District through 2018	% of Implemented Funds (\$3.36B)
62	\$25,787,935	0.9%
63	\$58,222,073	2.1%
64	\$87,263,003	3.2%
65	\$67,130,435	2.5%
66	\$16,205,260	0.6%
67	\$13,236,834	0.5%
68	\$74,290,002	2.7%
69	\$100,132,134	3.7%
70	\$134,140,996	4.9%
71	\$51,842,152	1.9%
72	\$24,002,290	0.9%
73	\$66,783,936	2.4%
74	\$74,054,155	2.7%
75	\$11,498,778	0.4%
76	\$56,197,902	2.1%
77	\$21,478,883	0.8%
78	\$90,956,296	3.3%
79	\$83,487,574	3.1%
80	\$114,122,681	4.2%


## Reference Maps to Display MPO, County, and Legislative Boundaries

### California Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Boundaries





## State Senate Districts



## State Assembly Districts

